

Exhibit 29

2-211

I'm trying to disentangle ethical and legal considerations. And you are conflating in your questions, which makes it impossible for me to answer.

Q. All right. So what is it that you were looking for from the Boston Book Festival on June 18, 2018 that would have ended your legal dispute with the BBF and with Sonya Larson?

MS. ELOVECKY: Objection.

You can answer, if you're able.

A. As I recall, I wanted text published by the BBF that would not infringe on my original work.

I wanted an acknowledgment of why the text had been changed, and in exchange for a limited use license, I wanted compensation for my legal fees or some contribution to my legal fees.

When you're talking about kidney links, they asked me and I provided -- I fulfilled -- excuse me -- their request and many times you've been asking about my request about kidney links. You have it completely backwards. They asked me to help them. I fulfilled their request as an

2-213

her story, and do you believe that the letter within Sonya Larson's story that was revised by her still infringes your text letter of July of 2015?

A. I'm not a lawyer, and this has not yet been adjudicated. I don't feel I can answer the question whether it infringes, but I was not satisfied and did not feel I should waive my claims based on the revision, particularly not after the BBF had told me it would be completely redrafted and the letter in Sonya's story was not completely redrafted, and that's the circumstance in which I encountered the text in that context.

The BBF had not been honest with me and misled me about the changes that they required Sonya to make.

Also, there was no compensation of my costs which got as high --

Q. Let's limit it to the text right now.

A. -- which got as high as -- it's my right as the deponent to finish my answer. And I'm done, Attorney Epstein.

Q. It's my right, as the interrogator to limit your answer to my question. My question is